



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,967	01/15/2002	Virginie Tessier	01200.558	2808

7590

09/16/2003

Longacre & White
Suite 240
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Bethesda, MD 20817

EXAMINER

WIMER, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2821

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/030,967

Applicant(s)

TESSIER ET AL.

Examiner

Michael C. Wimer

Art Unit

2821

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/27/2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claim 1, line 7, the language "stacked on one another" is not entirely clear with respect to the structure. What is meant that wire is stacked? Do the turns touch, short out or insulated from one another? Such interrelationship of electrical properties of the antenna are absent from the claims that define the invention. It is not understood what is meant that each turn defines a turn surface, because in lines 9-11, it appears that each strand is the turn surface. Rather, it appears that applicant really intended for the entire or collection of strands of wire that are wound around the surface define a dimension that defines the height dimension (not each individual strand would define the height dimension of the antenna). Clarification of what defines the height dimension is required. In line 10, "ata" should be --at-- in order to eliminate any confusion in the claims.

In Claim 8, line 2, "means" should appear after "height".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2821

3. Claims 1-¹⁶_Λ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (2520986).

Regarding Claims 1-3, Williams et al show in Fig. 8 and 9, a flat-top antenna assembly comprising a dielectric, mechanical support 60 having a surface, a flat-top antenna positioned on the support and comprising a plurality of turns of multi-stranded conductors 61 extending parallel to one another and stacked on one another to define a height dimension of the antenna and connected end-to end (Fig. 9) and the height dimension is at a right angle to the turn surface (the turn surface is defined along the axis of the strands and are wound next to each strand to define the claimed height), all arranged as claimed. It is not taught that that wire used to wind the coil in Williams et al is multi-stranded. It may be solid copper. However, a skilled artisan would have found it obvious to employ multi-stranded wire, simply for the purpose of making the antenna wire more flexible in winding and thus lends itself to durability. Solid wire tends to easily break upon bending and suffering from fatigue, as is known in the art.

Regarding Claim 4, the use of two pieces to make one (as in nailing two boards together to make a larger dimension) is taken for granted in the art, such that it is obvious to the skilled artisan.

Regarding Claim 5-7, the holding means 62 is shown along with bracket 33 (Fig.4).

Regarding Claim 8, grooves in the support to hold the wire therein are an obvious choice in coil formers, as is widely established in the loop antenna art.

Regarding Claim 9, clip 33 is shown.

Art Unit: 2821

Regarding Claims 10-12 and 14, staples, bonding material and molding are all obvious means to mount the antenna assembly of Williams et al, as tape is used in Figs. 6 & 7 within the door panel (molding) or upholstery material 32 in Fig. 4.

Regarding Claim 13, a system of hands-free operation is an obvious use for the antenna assembly of Williams et al.

Regarding Claims 15 and 16, the Williams et al. antenna assembly is used in the roof or floor.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2821

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Wimer whose telephone number is (703) 305-3555. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don K. Wong can be reached on (703) 308-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Michael C. Wimer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2821

MCW
27 August 2003